Application No.: 09/843,888
Attny. Docket: 10006664-1

Response to Action
dated May 13, 2005

REMARKS

1.   In response to the Office Action mailed May 13, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 20-51 were last presented in the application. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 20-51were rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, claims 20, 33 and 43 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or been added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 20-51 will remain pending in this application. Of these thirty-two (32) claims, three (3) claims (claims 20, 33 and 43) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Art of Record

2.   Applicant acknowledges receipt of form PTO-892 identifying additional references made of record by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

3.   Independent claims 20, 33, and 43 and dependent claims 21, 23-32, 34, 36-42, 44 and 46-51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,832,263 to Polizzi (hereinafter, "Polizzi"). In addition, dependent claims 22, 35 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,615 to Nordenstam (hereinafter, "Nordenstam"). Based one the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

4.   As amended, claim 20 recites, in part, a method for providing customers of a network management portal secure access to customer information over a network, comprising: … storing in a first memory space allocated to a first customer information resulting from performance of a network management transaction by a web application executed for said first customer, wherein said network management transaction comprises gathering network information regarding a partition of the network allocated to said first customer and wherein the information stored in the first memory space comprises information for display to the customer regarding said gathered information…." (*See*, Applicant's claim 20, above.)

5.   In rejecting claim 20, the Examiner relied on col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 1 and col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 1 of Polizzi as allegedly disclosing storing information resulting from performance of a network management transaction. Col 10 line 66- col. 11, line 1 of Polizzi discloses that the stored objects of Polizzi may be 1) ordinary files (e.g, text documents, spread sheets…); 2) executable program files from applications such as Brio. Report, Oracle Reports, or SAP Reports; 3) user-defined groups of objects similar to file system similar to file system directories or folders; or 5) a file which encapsulates an Internet URL as well as metadata describing the link. This section, however, does not teach or suggest "gathering network information regarding a partition of the network allocated to said first customer and wherein the information stored in the first memory space comprises information for display to the customer regarding said gathered information, " as recited in amended claim 20.

6.   Col 6., line 65 – col. 7 line 1 of Polizzi is likewise fails to teach this feature of Applicant's claims 20. Specifically, this section of Polizzi discloses providing a stored output report to a user via a web client. This output report is described as being, for example, a report regarding manufacturing statistics for an enterprise, or a report regarding the current status's of the enterprises accounts receivable. (*See,* Polizzi col. 39-42). This section, however, neither teaches nor suggests "gathering network information regarding a partition of the network allocated to said first customer and wherein the information stored in the first memory space comprises information for display to the customer regarding said gathered information, " as recited in amended claim 20.

7.   Nordenstam does not cure the above-noted defects of Polizzi. In particular, Nordenstam, like Polizzi, fails to teach or suggest "gathering network information regarding a partition of the network allocated to said first customer and wherein the information stored in the first memory space comprises information for display to the customer regarding said gathered information, " as recited in amended claim 20.

8.   As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in amended claim 20. Applicant further respectfully submits that independent claims 33 and 43, which, as amended, include similar recitations to the above-discussed limitations of claim 20, are likewise allowable for at least the above-discussed reasons.

Application No.: 09/843,888
Attny. Docket: 10006664-1

Response to Action
dated May 13, 2005

Dependent Claims

9.   The dependent claims incorporate all of the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them a fortiori and independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections of the dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

10.   In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael G. Verga
Reg. No. 39,410
Tel. (703) 563-2005

August 9, 2005